



2814
41

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Atty. Docket

ROBERT A. BARNES ET AL.

PHN 17,661

SERIAL NO.: 09/675,251

GROUP ART UNIT: 2614

FILED: September 29, 2000

EXAMINER: M. Lee

PICTURE SIGNAL PROCESSING

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

AUG 09 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.111

This is in response to the Office Action mailed June 4, 2004, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,933,765 to Schiff et al. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has allowed claims 12 and 13, and has found claims 5, 9 and 11 allowable over the prior art of record.

Applicants traverse the above rejection and offer the following explanation.

The Schiff et al. patent discloses an enhanced TV system using transmitted error signals, in which video signals are encoded and transmitted to a receiver which thereupon decodes the received signals in order to recover the original video signals. In particular, the transmitter generates an error signal which is

combined with the encoded video signal which is then transmitted to the receiver. The receiver then separates the error signal from the encoded video signal and the decoder uses the error signal in decoding the encoded video signal.

The Examiner now equates the error signal of Schiff et al. to the quality indication relating to the analog picture signal of the invention as claimed in claim 1.

Applicants submit that the error signal of Schiff et al. is not an indication of the quality of the corresponding video signal. In particular, as described in Schiff et al., the decoder in the receiver includes a parameter detector 40 which, by its nature, "is susceptible to generating a number of erroneous control signals" (col. 3, lines 24-28). To counteract this, the transmitter includes a decoder 20, similar to the decoder 36 in the receiver, which includes a parameter detector 22 similar to the parameter detector 40 in the receiver. The transmitter also includes a parameter detector 14 "designed to produce substantially error free parameter control signals" (col. 3, lines 48-50). The outputs from the detectors 22 and 14 are compared and the difference is used to form a parameter error signal (PES) which is combined with the encoded video signal.

From the above explanation, it should be clear that the error signal (PES) of Schiff et al. is not an indication of the quality of the corresponding video signal, but rather, is an

indication of the quality (or lack of quality) of the decoder, and more specifically, the parameter detector in the decoder of the receiver. Applicants submit that the quality of the video signal does not have any effect on the error signal of Schiff et al.


In the subject invention, as claimed, the a quality indication relating to the analog picture signals is received with the analog picture signal. The quality indication is described in the Substitute Specification on page 3, lines 1-11 (paragraph [0008]), "Preferably, the first quality indication Q11 is the bit-rate and/or compression ratio and/or the quantization level at which the digital picture signal (used to form the analog picture signal) has been encoded and/or other information about the encoding or decoding..." Each of these parameters has a direct bearing on the quality of the analog picture signal.

The parameter error signal (PES) of Schiff et al. has no bearing on the quality of the corresponding encoded video signal. In particular, the PES arises solely due to cost savings in the receiver parameter detector. If, instead, the parameter detector 14 were used in the receiver, there would be no need for the parameter error signal.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-13, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

On August 3, 2004
By Burnett James



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

re Application of

Atty. Docket

ROBERT A. BARNES ET AL.

PHN 17,661

Serial No.: 09/675,251

Group Art Unit: 2614

Filed: September 29, 2000

Examiner: M. Lee

Title: PICTURE SIGNAL PROCESSING

RECEIVED

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AUG 09 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

Enclosed is an amendment in the above-identified
application.


[X] No additional fee is required.

[] The fee has been calculated as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED				
	Claims remaining after amendment	Highest number previously paid for	Number extra	Rate Additional Fee
Total Claims	13 Minus 20 ¹ =		X \$18 =	\$
Independent Claims	4 Minus 4 ² =		X \$86 =	\$
Multiple Dependent Claims, if any. If not previously paid, \$290.				\$
Total Additional fee for this amendment =				\$

¹If less than 20, enter 20. ²If less than 3, enter 3.

Please charge any fees which may be required, except the
issue fee, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.
14-1270.


Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
914-333-9611

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date
with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to the
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on August 3, 2004
Barnett James